Secrt. II-48—19,032—11-2-21

Revenue (1922) Department.

Miscellaneous SERIES.

G.O. No. 123

DATED 19-1-1922

[Despatch Abstract.]

Setlat - (South Kanara) - Mangalore taluk - Properties of the late Pachappa Shetty - Gift to widow and son - Partition - Fair Lease

29 9,678 20 11-19.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

REVENUE - E
056

AL 6.1.22

UNDER SECY. TO GOVT. 6-JAN.1922 REVENUE DEPT.

Received ..... 19 . *Registered* 6. 1. 1922

Subject.

Escheat (South Kanara) - Mangalore taluk - Property of Pachappa Shetty - Gift to widow and son.

****

ENCLOSURES.
No. .....
Spare copies .....

Reference No. A.5216-21-1

Station Madras. *Dated the* 3rd January 1922. -19-

From (Name) H.R.Uzielli Esquire.,I.C.S.,

(Designation) Secretary, Board of Revenue, Land Revenue.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Revenue Department.

L.T.Harris Esquire.,C.S.I.,I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue.

****

Read the following:--

Letter from R.H.Ellis Esquire.,I.C.S.,Collector of South Kanara, Reference No.5746-21-V-3, dated the 10th December 1921:

Escheat - Amur property - Deceased Pachappa Shetty - Gift to widow and son.

The above property situated in Mangalore Taluk was sold in March last, agreeably to Board's Proceedings

No.1123 Miscellaneous, dated 14th August 1918 and the price fetched was Rs.32,310/-. One-fourth of this amount viz., Rs.8077-8-0 was offered to the late Pachappa Shetty's son and widow as ordered in Government Order No.455 Revenue, dated 17th February 1909, communicated with Board's Proceedings No.798 Miscellaneous, Land Revenue, dated 13th March 1909 and they were asked to produce a joint receipt. In reply the widow has submitted a petition to me stating that her son had been misappropriating the one-fourth of the rents that was being annually paid to them hitherto and that if this sum also were paid to her son, he would misappropriate the whole amount and that therefore the amount should be paid to them separately, she being given ¾, as the two minor children of her deceased daughter are also dependent upon her. From enquiry it appears that these allegations are true, that the widow has no property whatever from which to maintain herself and her grand-children and that she has been left to herself to seek her own livelihood.

2. I presume that the Government, while passing the order No.455, referred to above, were not aware that the late Pachappa Shetty had also a minor daughter who was then unmarried. No doubt, the father of the children who is reported to be a man belonging to a rich family is alive, but according to the Aliyasantana Law by which these parties are governed he is not bound to maintain the children and they are therefore under the protection of the mother's

mother's mother.

3. In these circumstances, I think it just and proper to divide the amount into three shares and to pay two shares to the widow for herself and for the grand-children and one share to the son and request that the Board may be pleased to obtain the sanction of the Government to the proposed division.

****

REFERENCE

Submitted to Government.

2. The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.

5.1.22

Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Revenue Department.

A.S.R/4-1-22

AM 5/1/22 Am 5.1.22

Sectt. II-10 (a)—26,596—11-4-21.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.	26-1	
When copied	20-1-22	TKG
When examined	20-1	VVR
When signed		
When despatched	20/1	

Escheat - (South Canara) - Mangalore taluk - Properties of the late Pachappa Shetti, gift to widow and son - Partition - Sanctioned.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 455 Rev, dated 17-2- 1909

" " " " " " 192 .

READ ALSO:—

G.O. No. 56/2/22, From the Board of Revenue L.R. No. A/5216/-21-1 dated 8-1- 1922.

" " " " " " 192 .

" " " " " " 192 .

ORDER.

No. 123, dated 19th January 1922.

This

The proposals of the Board of Revenue is approved.

HS 18.1.22

D.P. 20.1.22

ASD 11.1.22

11.1.22.

19/1/22

To The Board of Rev. L.R.

DESPATCHED 20 JAN 1922.

Note: There is no legal objection to the proposed distribution because neither the son nor the widow is entitled to any share in the escheated property and both were shared to them as an act of grace

HS 18.1.22